

[4th March 1926]

(d) whether such fees have been refunded to any, and if so, how much and how many?

A.—(a) The scheme was introduced in January 1924, and the Board's report on it is not therefore due until after January 1927; Government have not therefore yet formed an opinion on the matter.

(b) to (d) The Government have not the particulars asked for. Instructions have been issued that a statement should be annexed to the report on the maintenance of Revenue records and registration giving particulars of the number of applications for subdivisions received in the year, number of subdivisions effected at the request of parties, fees charged and amounts paid to karnams. Information on the subject will thus be annually available in the future.

Introduction of the Land Revenue Bill.

* 1522 Q.—MR. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) why the Land Revenue Bill has not yet been introduced in the Council; and

(b) when the Government propose to introduce the Bill?

A.—(a) Because the subject is still under correspondence with the Government of India.

(b) The answer depends on the final result of the correspondence referred to in the reply to clause (a).

MR. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR:—"Will the hon. the Revenue Member be pleased to tell us at least approximately when he will be able to introduce the Bill?"

The hon. MR. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"I cannot possibly say, Sir. That depends as I have said in clause (b) of the answer on the result of the correspondence with the Government of India. It is not possible for me to foretell."

MR. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR:—"In view of the assurances given very often in this Council to the effect that the Bill will be introduced as early as possible, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to take the necessary steps to expedite the reply from the Government of India, at least so far as it lies in his power?"

The hon. MR. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—"Of course, Sir, we have been doing so all along."

Public Services.

Pay of unpassed men.

* 1523 Q.—MR. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that unpassed candidates who were confirmed prior to 6th August 1917 and before that period with reference to the notification appearing on page 473, Part I-B of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated

4th March 1926]

13th August 1918, were allowed to draw their increments, by the head of the department, from the date of introduction of the time-scale of pay, i.e., from 1st March 1921 ;

(b) whether these clerks were subsequently not only deprived of the benefits of the time-scale of pay with reference to G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925, but also ordered by the heads of offices to refund the amount of excess pay over the minimum of Rs. 35 already drawn by them from 1st March 1921 up to date ; and

(c) the reasons for this step ?

A.—(a) Yes, in some departments.

(b) & (c) Yes. Paragraph 4 of G.O. No. 164, Law (Education), dated 4th February 1925, referred to by the hon. Member, explains the reasons.

Heads of departments have, however, been informed that the Government are prepared to consider applications for waiver of recovery of overpayments by way of increments to the clerks in question.

Sriman SASIBUSHAN RATH Mahasaya :—“ Sir, it is stated in the answer ‘ Heads of departments have, however, been informed that the Government . . . in question.’ May I know if the Government intend to refund the recoveries already effected ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ That depends on the circumstances.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I know whether any recommendations have been received from the heads of departments ? ”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“ Yes, Sir, they are under consideration.”

Civil Justice.

The emoluments of the Official Assignee in Madras.

* 1524 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) the monthly emoluments of the Official Assignee in Madras ;

(b) whether the Government are considering the proposal to fix a monthly salary for him in the place of commissions ; and

(c) if not, why not ?

A.—(a) The Government have no information but will call for it.

(b) No.

(c) The question was considered by Government in 1924 in consultation with the High Court. As the majority of the hon. the Judges were opposed to any change in the existing practice, the Government did not consider it expedient to take further steps in the matter.